Third Member of Council.—

For the last one or two years.

Mr. V. Venkatappa.—

When is its report expected?

Third Member of Council.—

The draft is ready but it has to be passed finally by the Committee.

Mr. B. Devegowda.—

Will it be made available to the members of this Assembly?

Dewan.—

The report will be published.

MESSRS. S. LINGAPPA and G. KANCHAPPA (Chiknaikanahalli Taluk).—

Q.—13. Will the Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) How many Muzrai temples are there in the State?

(*b*) The names of villages in which each Muzrai institution is situated?

(*c*) Whether the Muzrai institutions in each taluk are in good condition or whether any are in disrepair?

(*d*) Whether the selection of Muzrai institutions for annual repairs is made talukwar? If not, whether it is not advisable to do so?

(*e*) Whether the Mallikarjunaswami temple at Pankajanahalli, Chiknaikanahalli Taluk, is not a major one and whether it is not in disrepair?

(*f*) Why this temple was not repaired till now?

(*g*) When will the Government get this temple repaired?

(*h*) What is the total amount available under the Muzrai Funds in respect of all temples in the State?

(*i*) What is the number of temples in the Tumkur District and the amount at their credit ?

(*j*) Whether this amount is spent on the respective temples or whether it is spent on other temples also?

(*k*) Whether the Government pay interest on this amount and if not whether it is not possible to do so ? and

(*l*) The amount at the credit of the temple at Hatyal, Tiptur Taluk, in the Muzrai Funds and the annual expenditure of the temple?

FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—13. (*a*) 4,413 Muzrai institutions other than village institutions.

(*b*) The list will be long and it will take time to prepare it.

(*c*) All Muzrai institutions are required to be maintained in good repair and for this purpose necessary rules are prescribed and provision of funds is being made for maintenance and repairs in the annual budget and scales of expenditure.

(*d*) Selection is made according to importance of the institutions and urgency of repairs required.

(*e*) No, it is a village institution. Reported to be in need of repairs.

(*f*) and (*g*) A rough estimate for Rs. 4,500 has been prepared on account of the repairs of the temple but the institution has only Rs. 77-8-0 at its credit.

(*h*) About Rs. 11 lakhs.

(*i*) 1,385. Rs. 98,890-15-10 in cash and Rs. 59,400 in investments.

(*j*) The funds of an institution are spent for its benefit and transfers are not ordinarily allowed.

(*k*) Surplus funds at the credit of Muzrai institutions are being invested for earning interest, as far as possible.

(*l*) (1) Rs. 3,938-2-11.

(2) Rs. 1,020 is the annual scale of expenditure.

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. S. Lingappa.—

Will the Government be pleased to state whether the Muzrai institutions in each taluk are in good condition or whether any of them are in disrepair?

First Member of Council.—

If information about particular institutions is required it will be possible to furnish it.

Mr. Appajiah.—

Did not the Government once promise in this Assembly to furnish a statement showing the condition of each temple for the information of the members?

First Member of Council.—

I do not remember.

Mr. Lingappa.—

At least, is there such a list maintained by Government?

First Member of Council.—

Yes.

Mr. Lingappa.—

Why was not the big temple referred to in (*f*) repaired although it required urgent attention?

First Member of Council.—

Information is given in the answer.

Mr. Ramaswamy.—

Have Government chalked out any regular programme *re* repairs of temples?

First Member of Council.—

Yes.

Mr. Ramaswamy.—

Will it be possible for Government to make suitable provision every year for repairs of the temples?

First Member of Council.—

Yes. The works will be taken up in the order of their urgency as far as funds permit.

Mr. Ramaswamy.—

What is the basis for selecting temples for repairs?

First Member of Council.—

The local authorities suggest the temples to be taken up for repair keeping all considerations in view.

Mr. Ramaswamy.—

Cannot the funds of one temple be diverted to another?

First Member of Council.—

No.

Mr. E. Krishnappa.—

Is the provision indicated in the budget sufficient for all Muzrai temples in the State?

First Member of Council.—

It is not possible to make a larger provision.

MESSRS. SORAPPA (Sira Taluk) and ESOOF KHAN SAB (Sira Municipality).—

Q.—14. Will the Government be pleased to state—

(*a*) The amount sanctioned by Government for the year 1928-29 on account of restoration and repairs of tanks in the State?

(*b*) The amount spent till now?

(*c*) In respect of how many works correspondence is going on between the officers of Revenue and Public Works Departments and which are they?

(*d*) How many tanks have been restored in recent years and how many are in progress ? and

(*e*) In respect of how many tanks projects have been prepared and what is their estimated amount ?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.—

A.—14. (*a*) Restoration .. Rs. 8,03,000.
Repairs .. Rs. 3,89,800.

(*b*) Rs. 5,99,319 to end of March 1929.

(*c*) 159. (*Vide* statement, Appendix IX.)

(*d*) 168 restored
356 in progress } since 1926-27.

(*e*) 311 tanks. Rs. 87,80,000.

MESSRS. B. S. PUTTASWAMY (T.-Narsipur Taluk), M. C. LINGE GOWDA and S. C. MALLIAH (Mandya Taluk), PATEL LINGE GOWDA (Krishnarajapete Taluk), K. V.